

## REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed May 18, 2003. Claims 1 – 19 were pending in the present application. Claims 1 – 19 remain pending in the application.

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pogue (PalmPilot: The Ultimate Guide, hereinafter “Pogue”).

In rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that “a container object is an object that contains/holds objects such as item data objects.” However, Applicant’s claim 1 further recites **“wherein the list container object is executable to specify a corresponding list item data object for each of a plurality of list item renderer objects.”** Applicant therefore disagrees with the Examiner’s assertion that “According to the language of the claims, the list container object could be interpreted as a directory that contains child objects or item data objects.” A directory, as is commonly understood in the art, is a data structure, and as such is not executable.

Likewise, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s assertion that “each item data object has a corresponding renderer object, which could be interpretable as internal data that is associated with an item data object, and being used for the system to render/display the item data object.” Internal data is not executable, and as such cannot be characterized as a **“list item renderer object” “executable to display the list item data object in the display device of the small footprint device,”** as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, even if, *arguendo*, the “internal data” is assumed to be associated with an item data object and used to render/display the item data object, Applicant can find no teaching or suggestion in Pogue wherein such action is taken **“in response to said list container object specifying a corresponding list item data object for each list item renderer object,”** as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly claim 1, along with its dependent claims 1 – 6, is believed to patentably distinguish over Pogue. Claims 7 and 13 recite features similar to those of

claim 1. Accordingly claims 7 and 13, along with their dependent claims 8 – 12 and 14 – 19 are believed to patentably distinguish over Pogue for at least the reasons given above.

Likewise, claim 2 recites “**wherein the list container object is executable to instantiate the plurality of list item renderer objects.**” As described above, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s characterization of a directory as a list container object. Accordingly, Applicant can find no teaching or suggestion in Pogue of the above limitation, and believes claim 2 to patentably distinguish over the cited art. Claims 8, 14, and 19 recite similar limitations, and are thus likewise believed to patentably distinguish over the cited art.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

No fees are believed necessary; however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 50-1505\5181-53800\BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin  
Reg. No. 33,929  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, Texas 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8800  
Date: 8-3-04